

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-7418

JAME' ABDULLAH KHALIQ,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GERALDINE MIRO, Warden; ANGELA PICKNEY RUIZ,
Adjustment Committee Hearing Officer; L. J.
ALLEN, Regional Administrator; TYRONE SUBER,
Senior Hearing Officer,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Charleston. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District
Judge. (CA-95-1312-2-17AJ)

Submitted: February 7, 1996

Decided: February 22, 1996

Before MURNAGHAN and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and PHILLIPS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jame' Abdullah Khaliq, Appellant Pro Se. John Gregg McMaster, Jr.,
TOMPKINS & MCMASTER, Columbia, South Carolina; Robert E. Peterson,
SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Columbia, South Carolina,
for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1988) complaint. Appellant's case was referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1988). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Appellant that failure to file timely, specific objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Appellant failed to object to the magistrate judge's recommendation.

The timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned that failure to object will waive appellate review. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985). See generally Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Appellant has waived appellate review by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED